

Mark E. Ellis - 127159
 Anthony P. J. Valenti - 284542
 Lawrence K. Iglesias - 303700
 ELLIS LAW GROUP LLP
 1425 River Park Drive, Suite 400
 Sacramento, CA 95815
 Tel: (916) 283-8820
 Fax: (916) 283-8821
 mellis@ellislawgrp.com
 avalenti@ellislawgrp.com
 liglesias@ellislawgrp.com

Attorneys for Defendant RASH CURTIS & ASSOCIATES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SANDRA McMILLION, JESSICA ADEKOYA,
 AND IGNACIO PEREZ, on Behalf of
 Themselves and all Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RASH CURTIS & ASSOCIATES,

Defendant.

Case No.: 4:16-cv-03396-YGR JSC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
 DEFENDANT RASH CURTIS &
 ASSOCIATES' MOTION TO AMEND THE
 COURT'S JUNE 18, 2018 ORDER DENYING
 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION [FRCP
 59(e)]**

**Date: August 21, 2018
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Courtroom: 1**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Defendant RASH CURTIS & ASSOCIATES' Motion to Amend the Court's June 18, 2018 Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration came on for regular hearing at 2:00 p.m. on August 21, 2018 in Courtroom 1 of the United States District Court in and for the Northern District of California. Plaintiffs SANDRA McMILLION, JESSICA ADEKOYA, and IGNACIO PEREZ were represented by L. Timothy Fisher and Yeremy Krivoshey of the law firm of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Defendant was represented by Mark E. Ellis, Anthony P. J. Valenti, and Lawrence K. Iglesias of the Ellis Law Group, LLP.

1 The Court finds that the circuits are in dispute on questions of controlling law which were
2 raised in Rash Curtis & Associates' motion for reconsideration, and that the Ninth Circuit has not
3 spoken on these issues. Specifically, the Court finds that each of the following issues raised in Rash
4 Curtis & Associates' motion for reconsideration involve questions of controlling law which a
5 substantial ground for difference of opinion exists:

6 (1) whether *ACA Int'l v. FCC*, 855 F.3d 687 (D.C. Cir. 2018) caused a substantial change
7 in controlling law;

8 (2) whether, after *ACA Int'l*, Rash Curtis & Associates' dialers constitute an "ATDS";
9 and

10 (3) whether Rash Curtis may be held liable under the TCPA for dialing a reassigned cell
11 phone number, where Rash Curtis had a good-faith belief that the information provided by its
12 creditor-client established "prior express consent" to dial that phone number.

13 The Court further finds that an immediate appeal from the Order may materially advance the
14 ultimate determination of the litigation by potentially narrowing the scope of issues to be tried, and
15 potentially bringing clarity as to the extent of potential class liability, if any.

16 Based on the foregoing, Defendant's Motion to Amend the Court's June 18, 2018 Order
17 Denying Motion for Reconsideration [FRCP 59(e)] is GRANTED in favor of Defendant, and the
18 Court will issue an Amended Order which will include the language required to bring an under
19 locutory 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), specifically, that the Order "involves a controlling question of law as
20 to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and that an immediate appeal from the
21 order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation."

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23
24 Dated: _____

25
26 _____
27 Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
28 United States District Court Judge